AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) Attorney Docket No.: Q80016

U.S. Application No.: 10/824,434

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-18, 20-26, 28, 30-32, and 34-37 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 4, 10, 19, 27, 29, and 33 without prejudice or disclaimer.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 22, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iverson (U.S. Patent No. 6,957,075) and Zancho (U.S. Patent No. 5,814,798). Claims 4, 8-16, 18-21, and 23-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iverson, Zancho, and Dong *et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0105543, hereinafter "Dong"). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iverson, Zancho, and Nakajima (U.S. Patent No. 7,095,456). Claim 37 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iverson, Zancho, and Miller *et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0046557, hereinafter "Miller"). Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iverson, Dong, Zancho, and Nakajima.

Applicants do not acquiesce to these rejections. In order to expedite prosecution, however, Applicants amend independent claims 1, 8, 13, 22, 28, and 30 to include the features of claims 4, 10, 19, 27, 29, and 33, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments place the application in immediate condition for allowance. For example, the amended claims recite, in some variation, that the UI support module further comprises a data format determining unit for determining whether the searched input/output module provided by the input/output module selecting unit can process a type of data of the UI support module,

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c) Attorney Docket No.: Q80016

U.S. Application No.: 10/824,434

through a table where the input/output modules and data formats that can be processed in respective input/output modules of the table are mapped.

The Examiner acknowledges that Iverson and Zancho do not teach this feature, and relies on paragraphs [0019], [0020], [0030], [0031], and [0033] of Dong as allegedly making up for this deficiency (November 24' 2008 Final Office Action, page 9, paragraph 4-1). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Dong is directed to a user interface loader (UIL) which provides an operation menu for a hardware device (e.g., a VCR) on a display screen (e.g., a TV) rather than the conventional method of providing the operational menu on the hardware device itself (Dong, paragraphs [0006] and [0013]). In the cited paragraphs, Dong merely discloses that based on an identifier of the hardware device, the UIL searches a local storage or a remote storage for a user interface corresponding to the hardware device identifier (e.g., paragraphs [0019]-[0020]). As noted above, the amended independent claims recite determining whether the **searched** input/output module provided by the input/output module selecting unit can process a type of data of the UI support module, through a table where the input/output modules and data formats that can be processed in respective input/output modules of the table are mapped. On the other hand, once the user interface is found in Dong, Dong does not teach or suggest performing any type of check on the found user interface to ensure that it is compatible. Accordingly, Dong alone, or in combination with Iverson and Zancho, does not teach or suggest the above-noted feature of claims 1, 8, 13, 22, 28, and 30.

18

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)

U.S. Application No.: 10/824,434

Attorney Docket No.: Q80016

The dependent claims, namely claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 11, 12, 14-18, 20, 21, 23-26, 31, 32,

and 34-37, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

Since claims 4, 10, 19, 27, 29, and 33 have been canceled, the rejection thereto is

rendered moot.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Registration No. 61,124

/ S. Stuart Lee /

S. Stuart Lee

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC

Telephone: (202) 293-7060

Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 13, 2009

19